arXiv:1606.00384v2 [math.AP] 22 Aug 2016

SUPPORT THEOREM FOR THE LIGHT RAY TRANSFORM ON MINKOWSKI SPACES

SIAMAK RABIENIAHARATBAR

Abstract. We study the Light-Ray transform of integrating vector fields on the Minkowski time-space $\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$, $n \geq 2$, with the Minkowski metric. We prove a support theorem for vector fields vanishing on an open set of light-like geodesics.

1. Introduction

Let (M, g) be a Lorentzian manifold of dimension $1 + n$, $n \geq 2$, with a lorentzian metric g of signature $(-, +, ..., +)$. Given a weight $\kappa \in C^\infty(M \times S^{n-1})$, in general, the weighted Light Ray transform of a vector field f is defined by:

$$L_\kappa f(\gamma) = \int \kappa(\gamma(s), \gamma'(s)) f_i(\gamma(s)) \gamma'^i(s)\, ds, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\gamma = \gamma_{x,\theta}$ is the family of future pointing light-like geodesics (null-geodesics) on M in the direction of $(1, \theta)$, $\theta \in S^{n-1}$. We choose a certain parametrization for the family of light-like geodesics γ. Since f is a vector field of order one, it is invariant under the re-scaling.

Light Ray transform has been attracting a growing interest recently, due to its wide range of applications. One major application of this transform is in the study of hyperbolic equations with time-dependent coefficients to recover the lower order terms from boundary or scattering information, see, e.g., [34, 28, 27, 42, 43, 29, 3, 12], and also recovering the lower order terms of time-independent hyperbolic equations [2, 22].

In the case where f is a function and supported in the cylinder $\mathbf{R} \times B(0, R)$ with tempered growth in the Minkowski space, Stefanov in [34] has shown that Lf determines f uniquely. The fact that Lf recovers the Fourier transform $\hat{f}$ of f (w.r.t. all variables) in the space-like cone $|\tau| < |\xi|$ in a stable way is used to show that the potential in the wave equation is uniquely determined by the scattering data. Moreover, since $\hat{f}(\tau, \xi)$ is analytic in the ξ variable (with values distributions in the τ variable), then one can fill in the missing cone by analytic continuation in the ξ variable. In a recent work by Stefanov [33], analytic microlocal methods is applied to show support theorems and injectivity of L_κ for analytic metrics and weights (on an analytic manifolds M) for functions. In particular, the results in [34] are generalized to a local data and independent of the tempered growth for large t.

Analytic microlocal method were already used in many works. Boman and Quinto in [5, 6] proved support theorems for Radon transforms with flat geometry and analytic weights (see also [26]). For related results using same techniques, we refer to [18,19] where the support theorem is proved on simple analytic manifolds (see also [8]). Uhlmann and Vasy in [41] used the scattering calculus to prove a support theorem in the Riemannian case near a strictly convex point of a hypersurface in dimensions $n \geq 3$ without the analyticity condition (see also [36,37, 38]).

Analytic and non-analytic microlocal analysis have been used to prove the injectivity and stability estimates for tensor fields of order two and higher. For the tensor fields of order two, Pestov and Uhlmann in [24] proved the unique recovery of Riemannian metric on a compact and simple Riemannian surface with boundary. See also Sharafautdinov [31] for related results. More general result on injectivity up to potential fields of the geodesic ray transform for tensor fields of any order on Riemannian can be found in [23]. In

Date: August 23, 2016.

Partly supported by a NSF Grant DMC 1301646.

[37, 38], a generic s-injectivity up to potential fields and a stability estimate are established on a compact Riemannian manifold M with non-necessarily convex boundary and with possible conjugate points. Microlocal method for tomographic problems is used to detect singularities of the Lorentzian metric of the Universe using measurements of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) radiation in [20]. It is described in [21] which singularities are visible and which cannot be detected. In [19], a Helgasons type of support theorem is proved for the geodesic ray transform of symmetric 2-tensor fields on a Riemannian manifolds (with boundary) with a real-analytic metric g. It is shown that the tensor field can be recovered up to a potential fields. In [15], authors studied the problem of recovery of a co-vector fields on simple Riemannian manifold with weight. Under some condition on weight, the recovery up to potential field and uniqueness are shown. See also [7], for the inversion of three dimensional X-ray transform of symmetric tensor fields of any order with sources on a curve.

Our main goal in this paper is to study the local and analytic microlocal invertibility of the operator L acting on vector fields on the Minkowski time-space $\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$ when the weight κ is simply one. We study the following operator L:

$$Lf(x,\theta) = \int f(s, x+s\theta)\cdot(1,\theta)\, ds, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\gamma = \gamma_{x,\theta} = (s, x+s\theta)$ is the family of future pointing light-like geodesics (null-geodesics) on the Minkowski time-space $\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$ in the direction of $(1,\theta)$, with $|\theta| = 1$. Note that above operator is a special case of the operator defined in (1.1).

The main novelty of our work is that Lf is known only over an open set of light-like geodesics, Γ, on the Minkowski time-space $\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$ (the Incomplete data case). Our results can be considered as a Helgason's type support theorems. The global invertibility (injectivity) of the operator L (the Complete data case) up to potential fields is already established, see for example [7, 43].

We generalize the method used in [33] to study the stable recovery of the analytic wave front-set of vector field f instead of functions, and prove the support theorems in the Minkowski time-space $\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$. For our purpose, we first introduce the Transverse Ray transform studied by Sharafutdinov in [31], and apply the analytic stationary phase approach by Sjöstrand [32] already used by the Stefanov [33] and Uhlmann in [38] (see also 8, 18, 19), to prove our results.

This paper is organized as follow: Section one is an introduction. In section two we state some definitions and our main result. Fourier analysis of the light ray transform L in the Minkowski time-space $\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$ is studied in section three. In section four, we consider the partial data and therefore apply analytic microlocal analysis and stationary phase method to recover the analytic wave front of vector field f. In the last section, we state an analytic continuation result and we prove our main theorem.

2. Main Result

We first state some definitions and a proposition which are necessary for our main results.

Definition 2.1. *We call vectors $v = (v_0, v')$ space-like if $|v_0| < |v'|$. Vectors with $|v_0| > |v'|$ are called time-like. Light-like vectors are those for which we have $|v_0| = |v'|$. We have the same definition for the co-vectors.*

Definition 2.2. *We say the set K is Light-like convex if for any two pints in K, the light-like geodesic connecting them lies in K.*

Definition 2.3. *Let K be a subset of Minkowski time-space $\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$. We say K expands with a speed less than one if*

$$K \subset \{(t,x) : |x| \leqslant C|t| + R\}, \quad \text{for some} \quad 0 < C < 1\ ,\ R > 0.$$

This definition allows us to integrate over a compact interval. In fact, since $\gamma_{x,\theta} \notin \operatorname{supp} f$ for (x,θ) near (x_0,θ_0), we may have the support as a compact set multiplying f by a smooth cut-off χ where $\chi = 1$ in a neighborhood of (x_0,θ_0).

In what follows we study the operator (1.2) and state the following proposition, see [35, Proposition 2.8], which motivates us to introduce the transverse ray operator I.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $f = (f_0, f_1, f_2) \in C^2(R^3, C^3)$ be such that $|f|$ and $|\partial f_i/\partial x^i|$ are bounded by $C(1 + |x|)^{-1-\epsilon}$ with some $C > 0$, $\epsilon > 0$. Then for any z,*

$$\partial_1 Lf(x,\theta) = \int_{\gamma_{x,\theta}} (\partial_1 f_0 - \partial_t f_1) + \theta^2(\partial_1 f_2 - \partial_2 f_1)\ ds = \int_{\gamma_{x,\theta}} -c_2 + \theta^2 c_0\ ds. \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\partial_2 Lf(x,\theta) = \int_{\gamma_{x,\theta}} (\partial_2 f_0 - \partial_t f_2) + \theta^1(\partial_2 f_1 - \partial_1 f_2)\ ds = \int_{\gamma_{x,\theta}} c_1 - \theta^1 c_0\ ds. \tag{2.2}$$

where $(c_0, c_1, c_2) =: \operatorname{curl} f$.

Proof. Let n ≥ 2 be arbitrary first. Fix $(1,\theta) \in R \times S^{n-1}$, and let $f \in C^1(R^{1+n}, C^{1+n})$, and $v \in R^n$. Then

$$(v.\nabla_x)Lf(x,\theta) = \int_R (v.\nabla_x) f(s, x + s\theta).(1,\theta) ds.$$

On the other hand, by the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus we have

$$\int_R \frac{d}{ds}[f(s, x + s\theta).(0, v)]\ ds = 0.$$

Subtracting above identities, we get

$$(v.\nabla_x)Lf(x,\theta) = \int_R ((0, v).\nabla_z) f(s, x + s\theta).(1,\theta) - \frac{d}{ds}[f(s, x + s\theta).(0, v)]\ ds.$$

Now let $n = 2$, then for the R.H.S of above identity after simplification we get

$$\int_{\gamma_{x,\theta}} v^1\partial_1 f_0 + v^1\theta^2\partial_1 f_2 + v^2\partial_2 f_0 + v^2\theta^1\partial_2 f_1 - [v^1\partial_t f_1 + v^2\partial_t f_2 + v^2\theta^1\partial_1 f_2 + v^1\theta^2\partial_2 f_1]\ ds,$$

which can be written as

$$(v.\nabla_x)Lf(x,\theta) = \int_{\gamma_{x,\theta}} -c_2 v^1 + c_1 v^2 + c_0(v^1\theta^2 - v^2\theta^1)\ ds = \int_{\gamma_{x,\theta}} \operatorname{curl} f \cdot (v \cdot \theta^\perp, v^\perp)\ ds \tag{2.3}$$

where $(v \cdot \theta^\perp, v^\perp) \in R \times S^1$, $v = (v^1, v^2)$, $\theta^\perp = (\theta^2, -\theta^1)$, and $\gamma_{x,\theta}$ is the light-like geodesics parameterized by their points of intersection with $t = 0$ and direction $(1,\theta)$. Note that $(v \cdot \theta^\perp, v^\perp) \cdot (1,\theta) = 0$.

Now take $v = (1, 0)$ to have the first equality, and $v = (0, 1)$ to get the second equality in the proposition. □

Remark 2.1. i) Note that we may also have the above proposition for all $n \geq 3$ when the ligh-like geodesics are restricted to three dimensional planes.

ii) In (2.3) We may replace $(v \cdot \theta^\perp, v^\perp)$ by general vectors ω orthogonal to $(1,\theta)$. To do so we need to find v such that for a given $\omega \in (1,\theta)^\perp$ we have

$$\omega^0 = v \cdot \theta^\perp, \quad \text{and} \quad \omega' = v^\perp.$$

Now setting $v = -(\omega')^\perp$ solves the problem.

This motivates us to introduce the following operator I which is called the Transverse Ray transform [see 31, Section 5.1]:

$$Ih(x,\theta,\omega) := \int_{\gamma_{x,\theta}} h \cdot \omega\ ds, \quad \text{where } x \in \mathbf{R}^n,\ \theta \in S^{n-1}, \text{ and } \omega \in (1,\theta)^\perp.$$

For $n \geq 3$, h is the generalization of curl given by the exterior derivative of the vector field f, $\mathrm{d}f$. In fact, one can associate a 1-form to the vector field f and then take the exterior derivative of the 1-form to get a 2-form as follow:

$$\mathrm{d}f = \sum_{k<j=0,1,2,3,\dots,n} c_{k,j} \quad dx^k \wedge dx^j, \quad \text{where} \quad c_{k,j} = \partial_j f_k - \partial_k f_j.$$

Now $c_{k,j}$ are the components of the generalized curl of the vector field f.

From now on, when $n \geq 3$, by $h = \mathrm{d}f$ we mean the generalized curl as we pointed above. In the case $n = 2$, h is just $\operatorname{curl} f$. Notice that the way the operator I is constructed in proposition 2.1, clearly $Ih = 0$ when $Lf = 0$.

One major advantage of using the operator I instead of the operator L is the fact that we may drop the solenoidal condition for the vector field as it will be clear in the following lemma. We may think of the operator I as a vector valued operator with image projected to the space $(1,\theta)^{\perp}$. So we may drop the ω in $Ih(x,\theta,\omega)$ in the definition. From now on we always assume that ω is in the set $(1,\theta)^{\perp}$.

Our main result is a support theorem in the spirit of theorem 2.1 [33] as follow:

Theorem 2.1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{E}'(\mathbf{R}^{1+n})$ be so that* $\operatorname{supp} f$ *expands with a speed less than one. Let (x_0,θ_0) be a fixed light-like line in the Minkowski time-space and let G be an open and connected neighborhood of (x_0,θ_0) in $\mathbf{R}^n \times S^{n-1}$.*
If $Lf(x,\theta) = 0$ in G and if γ_{x_0,θ_0} does not intersect $\operatorname{supp} \mathrm{d}f$*, then none of the geodesics $\gamma_{x,\theta}$, $(x,\theta) \in G$, does.*

3. Fourier Analysis in the Minkowski case

In this section we consider the case that we have a complete data of the light ray transform over the light-like geodesics. This will allow us to do the Fourier Analysis by fixing the initial point and stay in a small neighborhood of the direction $(1,\theta)$. As we mentioned above, this case has been already studied. We do this analysis to have some insight for the microlocal analysis part of our study.

The following lemma is some preliminary results that the operator I recovers the Fourier transform of the field h, $\mathcal{F}(h)$, in the space-like cone $\{(\tau,\xi) : |\tau| < |\xi|\}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^{1+n})$.*

i) For $n = 2$, if $Ih(x,\theta,\omega) = 0$ for all x and ω, for θ near $\pm\theta_0$, then $\mathcal{F}(h) = 0$ for ζ close ζ_0, where ζ_0 is the unique space-like vector up to re-scaling with the property $(1,\pm\theta_0)\cdot\zeta_0 = 0$.

ii) For $n \geq 3$, if $Ih(x,\theta,\omega) = 0$ for all x and ω, for θ near θ_0, then $\mathcal{F}(h) = 0$ for all ζ near the set $\{\zeta \big| (1,\theta)\cdot\zeta = 0\}$.

Proof. i) Case 1: $n = 2$.

Let $\zeta^0 = (\tau^0, (\xi^1)^0, (\xi^2)^0)$ be a fixed space-like vector and without loss of generality assume that $\theta_0 = \pm\mathbf{e}_2 \in \mathbf{R}^2$ such that $(1,\pm\theta_0)\cdot\zeta^0 = 0$. One has

$$\tau^0 \pm (\xi^2)^0 = 0 \quad \text{which implies that } \tau^0 = (\xi^2)^0 = 0.$$

So this shows that ζ^0 has to be in the form of $(0,(\xi^1)^0,0)$ which means that up to re-scaling that is the unique ζ^0 with property $(1,\pm\theta_0)\perp\zeta^0 = 0$. Therefore one may choose $\zeta^0 = \mathbf{e}^1 \in \mathbf{R}^{1+2}$. Note that this choice of ζ^0 can be done since we may apply Lorentz transform to any fixed space-like vector and transform it to $\mathbf{e}^1$.

Since $Ih(x,\theta,\omega) = 0$, by the Vectorial Fourier Slice theorem, we have

$$\omega\cdot\hat{h}(\zeta) = 0, \quad \forall(1,\theta)\perp\zeta, \quad \forall\omega\perp(1,\theta). \tag{3.1}$$

Clearly $\omega = (1,-\theta)$ solves $\omega\cdot(1,\theta) = 0$, so for ζ^0 and θ_0 we have

$$(1,0,\mp1)\cdot\hat{h}(\mathbf{e}^1) = 0, \quad \text{which implies that } \hat{h}_0(\mathbf{e}^1) = \hat{h}_2(\mathbf{e}^1) = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

On the other hand, $\omega = (0, \theta^\perp) \in (1,\theta)^\perp$, so plugging into (0.4) we get

$$(0,\theta^\perp)\cdot \hat{h}(\zeta) = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Now our choice of fixed $\zeta^0 = \mathbf{e}^1$ implies that $\hat{h}_1(\zeta^0) = 0$, and therefore $\mathcal{F}(h)(\zeta^0) = 0$.

Now let $\zeta = (\tau, \xi)$ be any nonzero space-like vector. For $\xi \in \mathbf{R}^2$, having the equation $(1,\theta)\cdot\zeta = 0$, we solve for θ. Set $\theta = a\xi + b\xi^\perp$.

$$-\tau = \theta\cdot\xi = (a\xi + b\xi^\perp)\cdot\xi = a|\xi|^2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad a = \frac{-\tau}{|\xi|^2}.$$

On the other hand,

$$1 = |\theta|^2 = (a^2+b^2)|\xi|^2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad b = \pm\frac{1}{|\xi|^2}\sqrt{-\tau^2+|\xi|^2}.$$

For $\xi \in \mathbf{R}^2$, we set

$$\theta = \theta_\pm(\zeta) = \frac{1}{|\xi|^2}(-\tau\xi^1 \mp \sqrt{-\tau^2+|\xi|^2}\xi^2, -\tau\xi^2 \pm \sqrt{-\tau^2+|\xi|^2}\xi^1). \tag{3.4}$$

Clearly $(1,\theta_\pm(\zeta))\cdot\zeta = 0$ and $\theta_\pm$ are the only two choices with the property $|\theta_\pm(\zeta)| = 1$. In order to have ζ close to $\zeta_0 = \mathbf{e}^1$: we need to have $\theta^1_\pm = 0$, so we have

$$-\tau\xi^1 \mp \sqrt{-\tau^2+|\xi|^2}\xi^2 = 0.$$

Now since ζ is a space-like vector, $\sqrt{-\tau^2+|\xi|^2}$ is non-zero which implies that $\tau\xi^1 = \xi^2 = 0$. Now ξ^1 cannot be zero as we would have $\sqrt{-\tau^2}$. So this implies that $\tau = 0$ which shows ζ close to $\zeta_0 = \mathbf{e}^1$. This implies that $\theta = \theta_\pm(\zeta)$ is analytic near $\zeta^0 = \mathbf{e}^1 \in \mathbf{R}^{1+2}$ with $\theta_\pm(\zeta^0) = \theta_0 = \pm\mathbf{e}_2 \in \mathbf{R}^2$, and therefore $\theta_\pm(\zeta)$ is within a neighborhood of $\pm\theta_0$, $\theta \approx \pm\theta_0$, if ζ is within a neighborhood of ζ_0, $\zeta \approx \zeta_0$. Considering our choices of direction $\theta_\pm(\zeta)$, (3.1) can be written as

$$\hat{h}_0(\zeta) + \frac{1}{|\xi|^2}(-\tau\xi^1 + \sqrt{-\tau^2+|\xi|^2}\xi^2)\hat{h}_1(\zeta) + \frac{1}{|\xi|^2}(-\tau\xi^2 - \sqrt{-\tau^2+|\xi|^2}\xi^1)\hat{h}_2(\zeta) = 0, \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$\hat{h}_0(\zeta) + \frac{1}{|\xi|^2}(-\tau\xi^1 - \sqrt{-\tau^2+|\xi|^2}\xi^2)\hat{h}_1(\zeta) + \frac{1}{|\xi|^2}(-\tau\xi^2 + \sqrt{-\tau^2+|\xi|^2}\xi^1)\hat{h}_2(\zeta) = 0. \tag{3.6}$$

Subtracting (3.5) and (3.6) we get

$$\xi^2\hat{h}_1(\zeta) - \xi^1\hat{h}_2(\zeta) = 0. \tag{3.7}$$

Multiplying (3.5) by ξ^1 and using (3.7), we get

$$\tau\hat{h}_1(\zeta) - \xi^1\hat{h}_0(\zeta) = 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Similarly multiplying (3.5) by ξ^2 and using (3.7) we get

$$\tau\hat{h}_2(\zeta) - \xi^2\hat{h}_0(\zeta) = 0. \tag{3.9}$$

Now the way the operator I is constructed, ω is normal to $(1,\theta)$, so in (3.1) we may choose $\omega = \zeta$. Therefore we get

$$\zeta\cdot\hat{h}(\zeta) = \tau\hat{h}_0 + \xi^1\hat{h}_1 + \xi^2\hat{h}_2 = 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Now multiplying equation (3.10) by ξ^1 and using Equations (3.7), (3.8), and (3.9) we have

$$0 = \xi^1(\tau\hat{h}_0 + \xi^1\hat{h}_1 + \xi^2\hat{h}_2) = (\tau^2 + (\xi^1)^2 + (\xi^2)^2)\hat{h}_1 = |\zeta|^2\hat{h}_1. \tag{3.11}$$

Since ζ is a space-like vector and therefore nonzero, we get $\hat{h}_1 = 0$. Now using equations (3.7), (3.8), and (3.9) again we get $\mathcal{F}(h)(\zeta) = 0$

ii) Case 2: $n \geqslant 3$.

For now let $n = 3$ and $\zeta = \zeta^0$ be a fixed nonzero space-like vector. Applying the Lorentz transformation, we may assume that $\zeta^0 = \mathbf{e}^2 := (0, 0, 1, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^{1+3}$. Now we set

$$\theta_1 = \sin(a)\mathbf{e}_1 + \cos(a)\mathbf{e}_3 = (\sin(a), 0, \cos(a)).$$

Clearly $\big|\theta_1(a)\big| = 1$, $\theta_0 = \theta_1(0) = \mathbf{e}_3$, and $(1, \theta_1(a)) \cdot \zeta^0 = 0$.
Since $Ih(x, \theta) = 0$, by Vectorial Fourier slice theorem, equation (3.1), for $\omega = (1, -\theta)$ near $a = 0$ we have

$$(1, -\theta_1(a)) \cdot \hat{h}(\zeta^0) = 0. \tag{3.12}$$

We may rewrite (3.12) as

$$\hat{h}_0(\zeta^0) - \sin(a)\hat{h}_1(\zeta^0) - \cos(a)\hat{h}_3(\zeta^0) = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

Differentiate w.r.t a we get

$$-\cos(a)\hat{h}_1(\zeta^0) + \sin(a)\hat{h}_3(\zeta^0) = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Differentiate one more time w.r.t a we get

$$\sin(a)\hat{h}_1(\zeta^0) + \cos(a)\hat{h}_3(\zeta^0) = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

So near $a = 0$ for a fixed co-vetor $\zeta^0 = \mathbf{e}^2$, one may conclude that, $\hat{h}_0(\zeta^0) = \hat{h}_1(\zeta^0) = \hat{h}_3(\zeta^0) = 0$. On the other hand, by similar argument as for equation (3.10), we may choose $\omega = \zeta$ in (3.1) to get

$$0 = \zeta \cdot \hat{h}(\zeta) = \tau\hat{h}_0 + \xi^1\hat{h}_1 + \xi^2\hat{h}_2 + \xi^3\hat{h}_3,$$

and our choice of fixed $\zeta^0 = \mathbf{e}^2$ implies that $\hat{h}_2(\zeta^0) = 0$, and therefore $\mathcal{F}(h)(\zeta^0) = 0$.

To have the result for an arbitrary ζ, we use the fact that the Lorentz transformation is transitive and rotates every space-like vector to a space-like vector. Let $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta^0}$ be a Lorentzian transformation with the property $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta^0}\zeta = \zeta^0 = \mathbf{e}^2$ and let $\mathcal{L}$ with $\mathcal{L}y = x$ be a lorentz trasformation whose representation in Fourier domain is given by $\mathcal{L}_{\zeta^0}$. By the definition of Fourier transform one has

$$\mathcal{F}(h\mathcal{L}(.))(\zeta) = \int h(\mathcal{L}y)e^{iy\cdot\zeta}dy = \int h(x)e^{i\mathcal{L}^{-1}x\cdot\zeta}\big|det\mathcal{L}^{-1}\big|dx = \int h(x)e^{ix\cdot\mathcal{L}_{\zeta^0}^{-T}\zeta}\big|det\mathcal{L}^{-1}\big|dx. \tag{3.16}$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{F}(h\mathcal{L}(.))(\zeta) = \big|\det\mathcal{L}^{-1}\big|\mathcal{F}(h)(\mathcal{L}^{-T}\zeta). \tag{3.17}$$

But $\mathcal{L}^T = \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(\zeta) = \zeta^0$, hence

$$\mathcal{F}(h\mathcal{L}(.))(\zeta) = \big|\det\mathcal{L}^{-1}\big|\mathcal{F}(h)(\zeta^0) = 0, \tag{3.18}$$

since $\mathcal{F}(h)(\zeta^0) = 0$. This proves for any space-like co-vector ζ near ζ^0, the Fourier transform of h vanishes as desired.

In general case $n > 3$, let $\{\theta_k(a) = \cos(a)\mathbf{e}_1 + \sin(a)\mathbf{e}_{k+1} \in \mathbf{R}^n \big| k = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, n-2\}$ be a collection of independent unit vectors with $\theta_0 = \theta_k(0) = (1, 0, \ldots, 0) = \mathbf{e}_1 \in \mathbf{R}^n$(only $n-2$ independent unit vectors are needed.)

Now differentiating (3.12) once and twice (as we did for the case $n = 3$) for all $(1, \theta_k(a)) \perp \zeta$, $k = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, n-2$, near $a = 0$, we conclude that $\hat{h}_i$ vanishes for a fixed co-vector $\zeta^0 = \mathbf{e}^n$ $(i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n-1)$. Now for any arbitrary ζ, similar what we discussed above, we may apply a Lorentzian transformation to transform the coordinate system to our fixed system of coordinate to conclude that $\mathcal{F}(h)(\zeta) = 0$.

□

Corollary 3.1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^{1+n})$.*

i) For $n = 2$, if $Lf(x, \theta) = 0$ for θ near $\pm\theta_0$, then f is a smooth potential field with compact support, i.e., $f = d\phi$ with some $\phi(x) \to 0$, as $|x| \to \infty$.

ii) For $n \geqslant 3$, if $Lf(x,\theta) = 0$ for θ near θ_0, then f is a smooth potential field with compact support, i.e., $f = d\phi$ with some $\phi(x) \to 0$, as $|x| \to \infty$.

Proof. i) Set $h = \operatorname{curl} f$. By assumption $Lf(x,\theta) = 0$ near $\pm\theta_0$ so $Ih(x,\theta,\omega) = 0$. By the first part of proposition 0.2 we get $\mathcal{F}(\operatorname{curl} f) = 0$. Since $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^{1+2})$, we extend f as zero outside of the $\operatorname{supp} f$. Now by analyticity of Fourier transform, $\mathcal{F}(\operatorname{curl} f)$ is zero every where. Applying inverse Fourier transform implies that $\operatorname{curl} f = 0$ every where. Now since the space $\mathbf{R}^{1+2}$ is a simply connected domain, there exists a finite smooth function ϕ such that $f = d\phi$; In fact let $x \in \operatorname{supp} f$ and x_0 be a point outside of $\operatorname{supp} f$, and assume $c(t)$ be a path connecting x_0 to x. We define ϕ as follow:

$$\phi(x) = \int_{x_0}^{x} f(c(t)) \cdot c'(t) dt + \phi(x_0).$$

ii) Set $h = \mathrm{d}f$. Similar argument as part (i) proves $\mathrm{d}f = 0$ and therefore f is a smooth potential vector field with compact support. □

Remark 3.1. Notice that, by Fundamental Theorem of Calculus, the potential field is in the kernel of the operator L, so one could only hope to recover $\operatorname{curl} f$ for $n = 2$, and work on subspaces ro recove $\mathrm{d}f$ when $n \geq 3$.

Remark 3.2. For $n = 2$ there two discrete choices of directions, $\pm\theta_0$, and this is necessary to have the result. For $n \geq 3$, however, only one direction is enough as we may consider a one parameter family, $\theta(a)$, near θ_0.

Now we give an example which shows that one cannot decrease the number of directions from two to one. Let ζ be a space-like vector and $\phi \in \mathcal{S}$ be supported in the interior of open cone $\{|\tau| < |\xi|\}$. Now set

$$\eta = \hat{f}(\zeta) = (1, \frac{\xi^2}{\sqrt{-\tau^2 + |\xi|^2}}, \frac{-\xi^1}{\sqrt{-\tau^2 + |\xi|^2}})\hat{\phi}(\zeta). \tag{3.19}$$

Clearly η is a non-zero vector field in the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S}$ and is in the kernel of the light-ray transform as it solves $(1, \theta_+(\zeta)) \cdot \hat{f}(\zeta) = 0$ but not $(1, \theta_-(\zeta)) \cdot \hat{f}(\zeta) = 0$, where $\theta_\pm$ is defined by (3.4). Note that this example does not provide a compactly supported vector field.

So, it is insufficient to have only one direction to recover the vector field. This is due the fact that, in the Minkowski space of signature $1 + 2$ the intersection of light-like cone and time variable is just two points. This is an obstruction to consider only one ray and stay close to it to do the reconstruction. As we see below, this is not the case for the Minkowski space of signature $1 + 3$ or higher as we can stay close to a fixed direction and do the recovering process.

In the next section we state a theorem on the recovery of analytic space-like singularities in the Minkowski case which is a tool to prove our main result.

4. Microlocal Recovery of Analytic wave frontset

We, here, mainly follow the analytic microlocal analysis argument to show that we can recover all space-like analytic singularities of h co-normal to the light-like lines along with integration for operator I. (see also [33, lemma 3.1])

Theorem 4.1. *Let $h \in \mathcal{E}'(\mathbf{R}^{1+n})$ and let γ_{x_0,θ_0} be a fixed light-like line so that $\gamma_{x,\theta}(s) \notin \operatorname{supp} h$ for $|s| \geq 1/C$ with some C for all (x,θ) near (x_0,θ_0). Assume that*

i) For $n = 2$, if $Ih(x,\theta,\omega) = 0$ for all x,θ near $(x_0, \pm\theta_0)$, then $\mathrm{WF_A}(h)$ contains no space-like co-vectors co-normal to $\gamma_{x_0,\pm\theta_0}$.

ii) For $n \geqslant 3$, if $Ih(x,\theta,\omega) = 0$ for all x,θ near (x_0,θ_0), then $\mathrm{WF_A}(h)$ contains no space-like co-vectors co-normal to γ_{x_0,θ_0}.

Proof. i) Let $n = 2$ and $Ih = 0$ only near γ_{x_0,θ_0} so the localization is needed. We choose a local chart for the geodesics close to γ_{x_0,θ_0}, and without loss of generality we may assume that $x_0 = 0$ and $\theta_0 = \pm\mathbf{e}_2$. So we have $\gamma_0 = \gamma_{0,\mathbf{e}_2} = (s, 0, s)$.

Let $\zeta^0 \neq 0$ be a space-like vector, co-normal to γ_0 at $x_0 = 0$, with $(1, \theta_0)\perp\zeta^0$. Applying the Lorentz transformation, we may assume that $\zeta^0 = \mathbf{e}^1 := (0, 1, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^{1+2}$. Our goal is to show that $(0, \zeta^0) \notin \mathrm{WF}_A(h)$.

Let $\chi_N \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^2)$ be supported in $B(0, \varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, with $\chi_N = 1$ near $x_0 = 0$ so that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \chi_N| \leq (CN)^{|\alpha|}, \quad \text{for } |\alpha| \leq N. \tag{4.1}$$

Then for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, $\lambda > 0$, and θ close to θ_0,

$$0 = \int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda x\cdot\xi}(\chi_N Ih)(x, \theta, \omega)\,\mathrm{d}x = \iint e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda x\cdot\xi}\chi_N(x)h(\gamma_{x,\theta}(s))\cdot\omega \quad \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}x.$$

If $(1, \theta)\cdot\zeta = 0$ with $\zeta = (\tau, \xi)$, then $\gamma_{x,\theta}\cdot\zeta = (s, x + s\theta)\cdot\zeta = x\cdot\xi$. Make a change of variables $z = \gamma_{x,\theta}$ in the integral above to get

$$0 = \int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda x\cdot\xi}(\chi_N Ih)(x, \theta, \omega)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda x(z,\theta)\cdot\xi}a_N(z, \theta)h_i(z)\omega^i, \mathrm{d}z = \int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda z\cdot\zeta}a_N(z, \theta)h_i(z)\omega^i, \mathrm{d}z, \tag{4.2}$$

if $(1, \theta)\cdot\zeta = 0$ and for all $\omega\perp(1, \theta)$. Notice that $a_N(0, \theta) = 1$.

Now let ζ be a space-like co-vector near ζ^0 and set $\theta = \theta_\pm(\zeta)$ as we introduced in (3.4). As it is mentioned earlier, $\omega = (1, -\theta) \in (1, \theta)^\perp$. So we set

$$\omega = \omega(\zeta) = (1, -\theta_\pm(\zeta)) = (1, \theta_\mp(\zeta)),$$

and plug it into in the equation (4.2) to get

$$\int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda z\cdot\zeta}\tilde{a}_N(z, \zeta)h_i(z)(1, \theta_\mp(\zeta))^i\,\mathrm{d}z = 0, \quad \text{near } \zeta = \mathbf{e}^1. \tag{4.3}$$

Note that $\tilde{a}_N(z, \zeta) = a_N(z, \theta)$ where $\tilde{a}_N(0, \zeta) = 1$. Note also that for $\zeta \approx \zeta_0$, we have $\omega(\zeta) \approx (1, \pm\theta_0)$. As it will be clear later, we make another setting for ω to have an elliptic system to conclude the first part of the theorem.

In the next step we will apply the complex stationary phase method [of Sjöstrand [32], similar to the case where it is applied to the Caldern problem with partial data in [16] and to the integral geometry problem in [8, 38].] Therefore we need to analyze the phase function and its critical points.

Fix $0 < \delta \ll 1$ and let χ_δ be the characteristic function of the unit ball $B(0, \delta)$ in $\mathbf{R}^{1+2}$. With some w, $\eta \in \mathbf{R}^{1+2}$ close to $w = 0$, $\eta = \mathbf{e}^1$, multiply the l.h.s. of (4.3) by

$$\chi_\delta(\zeta - \eta)e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda(\mathrm{i}(\zeta-\eta)^2/2 - w\cdot\zeta)} \tag{4.4}$$

and integrate w.r.t. ζ to get

$$\iint e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi(z,w,\zeta,\eta)}b_N(z, \zeta, \eta)h_i(z)(1, \theta_\mp(\zeta))^i\,\mathrm{d}z\,\mathrm{d}\zeta = 0, \tag{4.5}$$

where $b_N = \chi_\delta(\zeta - \eta)\tilde{a}_N$ is a new amplitude and

$$\Phi = (z - w)\cdot\zeta + \mathrm{i}(\zeta - \eta)^2/2.$$

Now consider the phase function $\zeta \to \Phi$. If $w = z$, there is a unique real critical point $\zeta_c = \eta$, and it satisfies $\Im\Phi_{\zeta\zeta} > 0$ at $\zeta = \zeta_c$. For $w \neq z$, the phase Φ, as function of ζ, has a unique critical point $\zeta_c = \eta + \mathrm{i}(z - w)$.

Now we split the z integral (4.5) into two parts: over $\{z;\ |z - w| \leqslant \delta/C^0\}$, for some $C^0 > 1$, and then over the complement of that set. Since $|\Phi_\zeta|$ has a (δ-dependent) positive lower bound for $|z - w| > \delta/C^0$(for ζ real) and there is no real critical point for the function $\zeta \to \Phi$ in this set, we can estimate that part of integral. Since

$$e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi} = \frac{\overline{\Phi}_\zeta\cdot\partial_\zeta}{i\lambda|\Phi_\zeta|^2}e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi}, \tag{4.6}$$

using estimate (4.1), integration by parts N-times w.r.t. ζ, and the fact that on the boundary $|\zeta-\eta|=\delta$, the factor $e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi}$ is exponentially small with λ, we get

$$\Big|\iint_{|z-w|>\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi(z,w,\zeta,\eta)} b_N(z,\zeta,\eta) h_i(z)(1,\theta_\mp(\zeta))^i \,\mathrm{d}z\,\mathrm{d}\zeta\Big| \leq C(CN/\lambda)^N + CNe^{-\lambda/C}. \tag{4.7}$$

Now on the set $\{z;\ |z-w|\leqslant \delta/\tilde{C}\}, \tilde{C}\gg 1$, we apply the complex stationary phase method for the rest of ζ-integral in (4.5). To estimate (4.5) for $|z-w|\leq \delta/C^0$ we set

$$\psi(z,w,\eta) = \Phi|_{\zeta=\zeta_c}. \tag{4.8}$$

Therefore,

$$\psi = \eta\cdot(z-w) + \mathrm{i}|z-w|^2 - \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}|z-w|^2 = \eta\cdot(z-w) + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}|z-w|^2.$$

Clearly the new phase function $\psi(z,w,\eta)$ satisfies

$$\psi_z(z,z,\zeta)=\zeta,\quad \psi_w(z,z,\zeta)=-\zeta,\quad \psi(z,z,\zeta)=0 \tag{4.9}$$

For (z,ζ) close to $(0,\mathbf{e}^1)$ we use this phase function and apply [32, Theorem 2.8] and the remark after it to the ζ-integral above to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\iint_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi_\mp(z,w,\zeta,\eta)} b_N(z,\zeta,\eta) h_i(z)(1,\theta_\mp(\zeta))^i \,\mathrm{d}z\,\mathrm{d}\zeta\\
&= \int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi(z,w,\zeta_c,\eta)} b_N(z,\zeta_c,\eta) h_i(z)(1,\theta_\mp(\zeta_c))^i \,\mathrm{d}z\\
&= \int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,w,\eta)} b_\lambda(z,w,\eta) h_i(z)(1,\theta_\mp(z,w,\eta))^i \,\mathrm{d}z\\
&= \int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,\beta)} b_\lambda(z,\beta) h_i(z)(1,\theta_\mp(z,\beta))^i \,\mathrm{d}z\\
&= \int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,\beta)} h_i(z) B^i_{\lambda_\mp}(z,\beta)\,\mathrm{d}z \;= \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{n/2}(CN/\lambda)^N + CNe^{-\lambda/C})
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where $\beta=(w,\eta)$, and B is a classical elliptic analytic symbol of order 0 with principal part equal to $(1,\theta_\mp(\beta))$ up to an elliptic factor near $(z,\beta)=(0,0,\mathbf{e}^1)$. In particular,

$$\sigma_p(B^i_{\lambda_\mp}(0,0,\mathbf{e}^1) \equiv (1,\theta_\mp(0,0,\mathbf{e}^1))^i = (1,0,\mp 1) = (1,\mp\mathbf{e}_2), \quad \text{up to an elliptic factor.} \tag{4.11}$$

For $|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0$ with $\delta\ll 1$ and $|w|\ll 1$, η close to $\mathbf{e}^1$, the variable (z,β) in (4.10) is near $(0,0,\mathbf{e}^1)$ and then B is independent of N because $\chi_N=1$ near the origin. Choose now N so that $N\leq\lambda/(Ce)\leq N+1$ to get the following exponential error on the right,

$$\int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,\beta)} h_i(z) B^i_{\lambda_\mp}(z,\beta)\,\mathrm{d}z \;= \mathcal{O}(e^{-\lambda/C}) \tag{4.12}$$

Since $(1,\mp\mathbf{e}_2)$ are two linearly independent vectors, we have two independent equations(under-determined system). To get an elliptic (determined) system we need one more equation. For this purpose, we use the fact that $\omega=(0,\theta^\perp)\in(1,\theta)^\perp$. So set

$$\omega=\omega(\zeta)=(0,(\theta_+(\zeta))^\perp),$$

where $\theta_+(\zeta)$ is defined by (3.4). Notice that for $\zeta\approx\zeta_0$, $\omega(\zeta)$ stays within a neighborhood of ζ_0. This implies that we may choose $\omega=\omega(\zeta)=\zeta$. Now plugging it into in the equation (4.2) gives us

$$\int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,\beta)} h_i(z) B^i_{\lambda^\perp}(z,\beta)\,\mathrm{d}z \;= \mathcal{O}(e^{-\lambda/C}) \tag{4.13}$$

where $\sigma_p(B^i_{\lambda^\perp})(0,0,\zeta^0)=(\zeta^0)^i$.

Considering the principal symbols above, to show that they form an elliptic system of equations we consider the following system of equations. Equations (4.12) and (4.13) are equivalent to

$$(1,\theta_{\mp}(0,0,\mathbf{e}^1))^i h_i = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad (\mathbf{e}^1)^i h_i = 0, \quad i=0,1,2, \tag{4.14}$$

or

$$(1,0,\mp 1)^i h_i = 0, \quad \textit{and} \quad (0,1,0)^i h_i = 0, \quad i=0,1,2. \tag{4.15}$$

This in turn implies that $(0,\zeta^0) \notin \mathrm{WF_A}(h)$ which proves the first part of lemma.

ii) Let $n=3$; as we mention later the proof for $n>3$ will be in the similar fashion. By assumption $Ih(x,\theta,\omega)=0$ near γ_{x_0,θ_0}, so localization is needed. We choose a local chart for the geodesics close to γ, and without loss of generality we may assume that $x_0=0$ and $\theta_0=\mathbf{e}_n$.

Our goal is to show $(0,\zeta^0)\notin \mathrm{WF_A}(h)$ for ζ^0 a non-zero space-like vector and co-normal to γ_0 at $x_0=0$. Applying the Lorentz transformation, we may assume that $\zeta^0=e^{n-1}:=(0,\dots,0,1,0)\in\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$.

Let $\chi_N\in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n)$ be supported in $B(0,\varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon>0$, with $\chi_N=1$ near $x_0=0$ so that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \chi_N| \le (CN)^{|\alpha|}, \quad \text{for } |\alpha|\le N. \tag{4.16}$$

Then for $0<\varepsilon\ll 1$, $\lambda>0$, and $(1,\theta)$ close to $(1,\theta_0)$,

$$0=\int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda x\cdot\xi}(\chi_N Ih)(x,\theta,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}x = \iint e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda x\cdot\xi}\chi_N(x)h(\gamma_{x,\theta}(s))\cdot\omega\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Since $(1,\theta)\cdot\zeta=0$ with $\zeta=(\tau,\xi)$, then $\gamma_{x,\theta}\cdot\zeta=(s,x+s\theta)\cdot\zeta=x\cdot\xi$. Make a change of variables $z=\gamma_{x,\theta}$ in the integral above to get

$$0=\int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda x\cdot\xi}(\chi_N Ih)(x,\theta,\omega)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda x(z,\theta)\cdot\xi}a_N(z,\theta)h_i(z)\omega^i\,\mathrm{d}z = \int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda z\cdot\zeta}a_N(z,\theta)h_i(z)\omega^i\,\mathrm{d}z, \tag{4.17}$$

if $(1,\theta)\cdot\zeta=0$ and $\omega\perp(1,\theta)$. Notice that $a_N(0,\theta)=1$. Set

$$\theta_k(a,b)=(\sin(a)\sin(b))e_k+(\sin(a)\cos(b))e_{n-1}+(\cos(a))e_n, \quad k=1,2,\dots,n-2 \tag{4.18}$$

where b is a non-zero fixed parameter near zero. Clearly $\big|\theta_k(a,b)\big|=1$, $\theta_0=\theta_k(0,b)=e_n$. On the other hand, we know that $\omega=(1,\theta)\in(1,\theta)^\perp$. So we set

$$\omega=\omega(a,b)=(1,-\theta_k(a,b)),$$

and

$$\zeta_k(a,\xi)=(-\tau,\xi)=(-\theta_k(a,b)\cdot\xi,\xi)=(-\sin(a)\sin(b)\xi^k-\sin(a)\cos(b)\xi^{n-1}-\cos(a)\xi^n,\xi). \tag{4.19}$$

Note that for $\zeta\approx\zeta_0$ (and therefore $a\approx 0$), we have $\theta=\theta_k(a,b)\approx\theta_0$. Plugging ω into (0.39) we get

$$\int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\phi(z,\zeta)}a_N(z,\theta_k(a,b))h_i(z)(1,-\theta_k(a,b))^i\,\mathrm{d}z=0, \quad \text{near } a=0, \tag{4.20}$$

where $\phi(z,\zeta)=z\cdot\zeta_k(a,\xi), a_N(z,\theta_k(a,b))=\chi_N(x-s\theta_k(a,b))$ where $a_N(0,(a,b))=1$. Note that

$$\phi_z(0,\zeta)=\zeta, \quad \phi_{z\zeta}=\mathrm{Id}. \tag{4.21}$$

Later, as we did for the case $n=2$, we make another choice for ω to have an elliptic system and therefore conclude our result for the second part of theorem. The map $(a,\xi)\to\zeta\in\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$ is a local analytic diffeomorphism near $((0,b),e^{n-1})$. More precisely, the determinant of the Jacobean associated with the map $(a,\xi)\to\zeta\in\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$ is

$$\sin(b)\cos(a)\xi^k-\cos(a)\cos(b)\xi^{n-1}+\sin(a)\xi^n,$$

which is equal to $-\sin(b)\xi^k-\cos(b)\xi^{n-1}$ near $a=0$. But our choice of ζ^0 implies that the determinant is $-\cos(b)$ which non-zero when b is a fixed parameter near zero. Hence we may apply the Implicit function

theorem near $a = 0$ to locally invert the map to $\zeta \to (a, \xi) \in \mathbf{R}^{1+n}$. In fact we can compute it explicitly to get:

$$a = a(\zeta) = -\tan^{-1}(\frac{\xi^n}{\sin(b)\xi^k + \cos(b)\xi^{n-1}}) + \sin^{-1}(-\frac{\tau}{\sqrt{(\sin(b)\xi^k + \cos(b)\xi^{n-1})^2 + (\xi^n)^2}}),$$

which maps $a = 0$ to ζ^0 diffeomorphically. Therefore we can work in the ζ variables instead of the (a, ξ) ones to get

$$\int e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda z\cdot\zeta}\tilde{a}_N(z,\zeta)h_i(z)(1,-\theta_k(\zeta))^i\,\mathrm{d}z = 0, \quad \text{near } \zeta = e^{n-1}, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, n-2, \tag{4.22}$$

where $\tilde{a}_N(z, \zeta) = a_N(z, \theta_k(a, b))$ and $\tilde{a}_N(0, \zeta) = 1$.

In the next step we will apply the complex stationary phase method [of Sjöstrand] which means we need to analyze the phase function and its critical points.

Fix $0 < \delta \ll 1$ and let χ_δ be the characteristic function of the unit ball $B(0, \delta)$ in $\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$. With some w, $\eta \in \mathbf{R}^{1+n}$ close to $w = 0$, $\eta = e^1$, multiply the l.h.s. of (4.22) by

$$\chi_\delta(\zeta - \eta)e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda(\mathrm{i}(\zeta-\eta)^2/2 - w\cdot\zeta)} \tag{4.23}$$

and integrate w.r.t. ζ to get

$$\iint e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi(z,w,\zeta,\eta)}b_N(z,\zeta,\eta)h_i(z)(1,-\theta_k(\zeta))^i\,\mathrm{d}z\,\mathrm{d}\zeta = 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, n-2, \tag{4.24}$$

where $b_N = \chi_\delta(\zeta - \eta)\tilde{a}_N$ is a new amplitude and

$$\Phi = (z - w)\cdot\zeta + \mathrm{i}(\zeta - \eta)^2/2.$$

Now consider the phase function $\zeta \to \Phi$. If $w = z$, there is a unique real critical point $\zeta_c = \eta$, and it satisfies $\Im\Phi_{\zeta\zeta} > 0$ at $\zeta = \zeta_c$. For $w \neq z$, the phase Φ, as function of ζ, has a unique critical point $\zeta_c = \eta + \mathrm{i}(z - w)$.

Now we split the z integral (4.24) into two parts: over $\{z;\ |z - w| \leqslant \delta/C^0\}$, for some $C^0 > 1$, and then over the complement of that set. Since $|\Phi_\zeta|$ has a (δ-dependent) positive lower bound for $|z - w| > \delta/C^0$(for ζ real) and there is no real critical point for the function $\zeta \to \Phi$ in this set, we can estimate that part of integral. Since

$$e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi} = \frac{\overline{\Phi}_\zeta\cdot\partial_\zeta}{i\lambda|\Phi_\zeta|^2}e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi}, \tag{4.25}$$

using estimate (4.16), integration by parts N-times w.r.t. ζ, and the fact that on the boundary $|\zeta - \eta| = \delta$, the factor $e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi}$ is exponentially small with λ, we get

$$\Big|\iint_{|z-w|>\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi(z,w,\zeta,\eta)}b_N(z,\zeta,\eta)h_i(z)(1,-\theta_k(\zeta))^i\,\mathrm{d}z\,\mathrm{d}\zeta\Big| \leq C(CN/\lambda)^N + CNe^{-\lambda/C}. \tag{4.26}$$

Now on the set $\{z;\ |z - w| \leqslant \delta/\tilde{C}\}, \tilde{C} \gg 1$, we apply stationary phase method for the rest of ζ-integral in (4.24). To estimate (4.24) for $|z - w| \leq \delta/C^0$ we set

$$\psi(z, w, \eta) = \Phi|_{\zeta=\zeta_c}. \tag{4.27}$$

Therefore,

$$* \quad \psi = \eta\cdot(z - w) + \mathrm{i}|z - w|^2 - \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}|z - w|^2 = \eta\cdot(z - w) + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}|z - w|^2.$$

Clearly the new phase function $\psi(z, w, \eta)$ satisfies

$$\psi_z(z, z, \eta) = \eta = \phi_z(0, \eta), \quad \psi_w(z, z, \eta) = -\eta = -\phi_z(0, \eta), \quad \psi(z, z, \eta) = 0 \tag{4.28}$$

For (z,ζ) close to $(0,e^{n-1})$ we use this phase function and apply [32, Theorem 2.8] and the remark after it to the ζ-integral above to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\iint_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi(z,w,\zeta,\eta)}b_N(z,\zeta,\eta)h_i(z)(1,-\theta_k(\zeta))^i\,\mathrm{d}z\,\mathrm{d}\zeta\\
&=\int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\Phi(z,w,\zeta_c,\eta)}b_N(z,\zeta_c,\eta)h_i(z)(1,-\theta_k(\zeta_c))^i\,\mathrm{d}z\\
&=\int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,w,\eta)}b_\lambda(z,w,\eta)h_i(z)(1,-\theta_k(z,w,\eta))^i\,\mathrm{d}z\\
&=\int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,\beta)}b_\lambda(z,\beta)h_i(z)(1,-\theta_k(z,\beta))^i\,\mathrm{d}z\\
&=\int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,\beta)}h_i(z)B^i_{\lambda_k}(z,\beta)\,\mathrm{d}z\;=\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{n/2}(CN/\lambda)^N+CNe^{-\lambda/C}),\qquad k=1,2,\dots,n-2
\end{aligned}\tag{4.29}$$

where $\beta=(w,\eta)$, and B is a classical elliptic analytic symbol of order 0. For $|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0$ with $\delta\ll 1$ and $|w|\ll 1$, η close to $\mathbf{e}^{n-1}$, the variable (z,β) in (4.29) is near $(0,0,\mathbf{e}^{n-1})$ and then B is independent of N because $\chi_N=1$ near the origin. Choose now N so that $N\leq\lambda/(Ce)\leq N+1$ to get the following exponential error on the right,

$$\int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,\beta)}h_i(z)B^i_{\lambda_k}(z,\beta)\,\mathrm{d}z\;=\mathcal{O}(e^{-\lambda/C}),\qquad k=1,2,\dots,n-2.\tag{4.30}$$

Now by (4.28) on a small neighborhood of ζ^0 we consider the following change of variables:

$$(z,w,\eta)\longrightarrow(z,w,\zeta)=(z,w,\phi_z(w,\eta)).\tag{4.31}$$

Applying above change of variables in (4.30) we get

$$\int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,w,\zeta)}h_i(z)B^i_{\lambda_k}(z,w,\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}z\;=\mathcal{O}(e^{-\lambda/C}),\qquad k=1,2,\dots,n-2,\tag{4.32}$$

where the function ψ satisfies (4.28) and B^i_λ is a new function with same property as before (a classical elliptic symbol of order 0.) Now the principal part of the symbols in (4.32) satisfy

$$\sigma_p(B_{\lambda_k}(z,z,\zeta))\equiv(1,-\theta_k(\zeta)),\quad\text{ up to an elliptic factor,}\tag{4.33}$$

so in particular at $(z,w,\zeta)=(0,0,\zeta^0)$ we have,

$$\sigma_p(B_{\lambda_k}(0,0,\zeta^0))\equiv(1,\theta_k(\zeta^0))=(1,0,\dots,0,-1)=(1,-\mathbf{e}_n),\quad\text{ up to an elliptic factor.}\tag{4.34}$$

As we showed before, the map $(a,\xi)\to\zeta$ is a local diffeomorphsim near $a=0$ (equivalently near $\zeta^0=e^{n-1}$). So we may work with the principal symbol in terms of (a,ξ) instead. So up to an elliptic factor, we get

$$\sigma_p(B_{\lambda_k}(z,z,(a,\xi))\equiv(1,-\theta_k(a,b)).\tag{4.35}$$

In order to recover the analytic wave front-set of the vector field f, we need to have an elliptic (determined) system of equations (symbols) in the sense of (4.32). Small perturbations of $\theta_k(a,b)$ near $a\approx 0$ provides us three equations which is under-determined. To get the fourth equation and therefore the determined system, we use the fact that $\omega=(0,\theta^\perp)\in(1,\theta)^\perp$, and set

$$\omega=\omega(a,b)=(0,(\theta_k(a,b))^\perp),$$

Now note that for $\zeta\approx\zeta_0$, $\omega(a,b)$ stays within a neighborhood of ζ_0. So similar to the case $n=2$, we choose $\omega=\omega(\zeta)=\zeta$ (we remind that the map $(a,\xi)\to\zeta\in\mathbf{R}^{1+n}$ is a local analytic diffeomorphism near $((0,b),e^{n-1})$), and plug it into in the equation (4.17) to get

$$\int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,\beta)}h_i(z)B^i_{\lambda^\perp}(z,\beta)\,\mathrm{d}z\;=\mathcal{O}(e^{-\lambda/C})\tag{4.36}$$

where $\sigma_p(B^i_{\lambda^\perp})(0,0,\zeta^0)=(\zeta^0)^i$.

For now let $n = 3$, then we only have $\theta_1(a, b)$ and therefore $\zeta_1(a, \xi)$ as k can have 1 as its value. We slightly perturb $\theta_1(a, b)$ near $a = 0$, and let $\alpha = (w, \zeta)$, and $\{B^i_{\lambda_1}(z, w, \zeta)\}^3_{i=0}$ represent the following symbols:

$$\Theta = \{(1, -\theta_1(a, b)), (1, -\theta_1(-a, b)), (1, -\theta_1(0, b)), (0, 0, 1, 0))\},$$

where the last symbol is associated with equation (4.36). Now let $[A]$ be the matrix associated with above principle symbols. The determinant of $[A]$:

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\sin(a)\sin(b) & -\sin(a)\cos(b) & -\cos(a) \\ 1 & \sin(a)\sin(b) & \sin(a)\cos(b) & -\cos(a) \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 2\sin(a)\sin(b)(1 - \cos(a)), \tag{4.37}$$

which is nonzero for a and our fixed parameter b near zero. Therefore (4.32) with above principal symbols leads to a system of four linearly independent equations, that is, in the coordinate system related to $\theta_0 = \mathbf{e}_n$ we have:

$$\int_{|z-w|\leq\delta/C^0} e^{\mathrm{i}\lambda\psi(z,w,\zeta)} h_i(z) B^i_\lambda(z, w, \zeta)\, \mathrm{d}z \, = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\lambda/C}), \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \tag{4.38}$$

where the phase function ψ satisfies the conditions (4.28), and $\Im\psi > C_0|z - w|^2$ as $\psi_{z\zeta} = \mathrm{Id}$.

Microlocal version of ellipticity is equivalent to show that $Ah = 0$ implies that $h = 0$. But $[A]$ is invertible and hence we have microlocal version of ellipticity and therefore $(0, \zeta^0) \notin \mathrm{WF_A}(h)$. To prove the general case, $n > 3$, one needs to consider the family $\{\theta_k(a, b) \in \mathbf{R}^n \big| k = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, n-2\}$ and small perturbation of each unit vector $\theta_k(a, b)$ in a similar way as we discussed above.

□

Corollary 4.1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbf{R}^{1+n})$ and let γ_{x_0,θ_0} be a fixed light-like line so that $\gamma_{x,\theta}(s) \notin \operatorname{supp} f$ for $|s| \geq 1/C$ with some C for all (x, θ) near (x_0, θ_0). Assume that*

i) For $n = 2$, if $Lf(x, \theta) = 0$ near $(x_0, \pm\theta_0)$, then $\mathrm{WF_A}(\operatorname{curl} f)$ contains no space-like co-vectors co-normal to $\gamma_{x_0,\pm\theta_0}$.

ii) For $n \geqslant 3$, if $Lf(x, \theta) = 0$ near (x_0, θ_0), then $\mathrm{WF_A}(\mathrm{d}f)$ contains no space-like co-vectors co-normal to γ_{x_0,θ_0}.

Proof. i) Set $h = \operatorname{curl} f$. By assumption we have $Lf(x, \theta) = 0$ near $\pm\theta_0$, so $Ih(x, \theta, \omega) = 0$ for all x and $\omega \perp (1, \theta)$. Now the first part of theorem 4.1 proves part (i).

ii) Set $h = \mathrm{d}f$. Now the second part of theorem 4.1 with similar argument in part (i) proves the second part.

□

5. Proof of Main Results

For our main result we need the following lemma which is a unique analytic continuation result across a time-like hypersurface in the Minkowski time-space.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(R^{1+n})$ and let γ_{x_0,θ_0} be a fixed light-like geodesics in the Minkowski time-space so that $\gamma_{x,\theta}$ does not intersect $\operatorname{supp} f$ for $|s| \geq 1/C$ with some C for all (x, θ) near (x_0, θ_0). Fix $z_0 = (s_0, x_0 + s_0\theta_0) \in \gamma_{x_0,\theta_0}$, let S be an analytic time-like hypersurface near z_0 and assume that γ_{x_0,θ_0} is tangent to S at z_0. If $Lf(x, \theta) = 0$ near (x_0, θ_0) and if $\mathrm{d}f = 0$ on one side of S near z_0, then $\mathrm{d}f = 0$ near z_0 .*

Proof. Set $h = \mathrm{d}f$ and assume that $z_0 \in \operatorname{supp} h$. Clearly by assumption $Ih(x, \theta, \omega) = 0$ near (z_0, θ_0). Since h is non-zero only in half space S, then there exists ζ_0 such that $(z_0, \zeta_0) \in \mathrm{WF_A}\, h$, as h cannot be analytic at z_0. Now by Sato-Kawai-Kashiwara theorem (see [30, 32]), $(z_0, \zeta_0 + s\nu(z_0)) \in \mathrm{WF_A}\, h$, where $\nu(z_0)$ is one of the two unit co-normals to S at z_0. This in turn implies that $(z_0, \frac{\zeta_0}{s} + \nu(z_0)) \in \mathrm{WF_A}\, h$ as the wave front-set is a conic set. Now passing to limit we have $(z_0, \nu(z_0)) \in \mathrm{WF_A}\, h$ since the wave front-set is closed.

By assumption on S, that co-vector is space-like and is co-normal to $\gamma'_{x_0,\theta_0}(s_0)$. This contradicts the above theorem 4.1, which implies that $h = 0$ and completes the proof. □

Remark 5.1. We may have the Lemma 5.1 for the operator Ih as well.

Now we are ready to prove our main result.

Proof of theorem 2.1. Set $h = \mathrm{d}f$. Then $Ih(x, \theta, \omega) = 0$ as $Lf(x, \theta) = 0$. Now the proof follows from [33, Theorem 2.1] replacing $Lf(x, \theta)$ by $Ih(x, \theta, \omega)$. □

References

[1] A. Begmatov. A certain inversion problem for the ray transform with incomplete data. Siberian Math. Journal, 42(3):428434, 2001.

[2] M. Bellassoued and D. Dos Santos Ferreira. Stability estimates for the anisotropic wave equation from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. Inverse Probl. Imaging, 5(4):745773, 2011.

[3] I. Ben Aicha. Stability estimate for hyperbolic inverse problem with time dependent coefficient. arXiv:1506.01935, 2015.

[4] J. Boman. Helgasons support theorem for Radon transformsa new proof and a generalization. In Mathematical methods in tomography (Oberwolfach, 1990), volume 1497 of Lecture Notes in Math., pages 15. Springer, Berlin, 1991.

[5] J. Boman and E. T. Quinto. Support theorems for real-analytic Radon transforms. Duke Math. J., 55(4):943948, 1987.

[6] J. Boman and E. T. Quinto. Support theorems for Radon transforms on real analytic line complexes in three-space. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 335(2):877890, 1993.

[7] A. Denisiuk. Inversion of the x-ray transform for 3D symmetric tensor fields with sources on a curve. Inverse Problems, 22 (2006) 399411.

8] B. Frigyik, P. Stefanov, and G. Uhlmann. The X-ray transform for a generic family of curves and weights. J.Geom. Anal., 18(1):89108, 2008.

[9] A. Greenleaf and G. Uhlmann. Nonlocal inversion formulas for the X-ray transform. Duke Math. J., 58(1):205240, 1989.

[10] A. Greenleaf and G. Uhlmann. Estimates for singular Radon transforms and pseudodifferential operators with singular symbols. J. Funct. Anal., 89(1):202232, 1990.

[11] A. Greenleaf and G. Uhlmann. Microlocal techniques in integral geometry. In Integral geometry and tomography (Arcata, CA, 1989), volume 113 of Contemp. Math., pages 121135. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1990.

[12] V. Guillemin. On some results of Gelfand in integral geometry. In Pseudodifferential operators and applications (Notre Dame, Ind., 1984), volume 43 of Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., pages 149155. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1985.

[13] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg. Geometric asymptotics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1977. Mathematical Surveys, No. 14.

[14] S. Helgason. The Radon transform, volume 5 of Progress in Mathematics. Birkhuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, second edition, 1999.

[15] S. Holman and P. Stefanov. The Weighted Doppler Transform.

[16] C. E. Kenig, J. Sjstrand, and G. Uhlmann. The Caldern problem with partial data. Ann. of Math. (2), 165(2):567591, 2007.

[17] Y. Kian. Recovery of time-dependent damping coefficients and potentials appearing in wave equation from partial data. arXiv:1603.09600,2016.

[18] V. P. Krishnan. A support theorem for the geodesic ray transform on functions. J. Fourier Anal. Appl., 15(4):515520, 2009.

[19] V. P. Krishnan and P. Stefanov. A support theorem for the geodesic ray transform of symmetric tensor fields. Inverse Probl. Imaging, 3(3):453464, 2009.

[20] M. Lassa, L. Oksanen, P. Stefanov, and G. Uhlmann. On the Inverse Problem of Finding Cosmic Strings and Other Topological Defects. arXiv:1505.03123

[21] R. B. Melrose. Spectral and scattering theory for the Laplacian on asymptotically Euclidian spaces. In Spectral and scattering theory (Sanda, 1992), volume 161 of Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., pages 85130. Dekker, New York, 1994.

[22] C. Montalto. Stable determination of a simple metric, a covector field and a potential from the hyperbolic Dirichlet-to Neumann map. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 39(1):120145, 2014.

[23] G.P. Paternain, M. Salo and G. Uhlmann, Tensor tomography on simple surfaces, arXiv:1109.0505, to appear in Invent. Math.

[24] L. Pestov and G. Uhlmann. Two dimensional simple compact manifolds with boundary are boundary rigid, Ann.Math.161(2)(2005),10891106.

[25] A. Z. Petrov. Einstein Spaces. Translated from the Russian by R. F. Kelleher. Translation edited by J. Woodrow. Pergamon Press, Oxford-Edinburgh-New York, 1969.

[26] E.T. Quinto. Real analytic Radon transforms on Rank one symmetric spaces, Proc. Math. Soc. 117(1993), 179-186.

[27] A. G. Ramm and Rakesh. Property C and an inverse problem for a hyperbolic equation. J. Math. Anal. Appl., 156(1):209219, 1991.

[28] A. G. Ramm and J. Sjstrand. An inverse problem of the wave equation. Math. Z., 206(1):119130, 1991.
[29] R. Salazar. Determination of time-dependent coefficients for a hyperbolic inverse problem. Inverse Problems, 29(9):095015, 17, 2013.
[30] M. Sato, T. Kawai, and M. Kashiwara. Microfunctions and pseudo-differential equations. In Hyperfunctions and pseudo-differential equations (Proc. Conf., Katata, 1971; dedicated to the memory of Andr e Martineau), pages 265529. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 287. Springer, Berlin, 1973.
[31] V. A. Sharafutdinov. Integral Geometry of Tensor Fields, Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems Series. VSP, Utrecht, 1994
[32] J. Sjöstrand. Singularit es analytiques microlocales. In Ast erisque, 95, volume 95 of Ast erisque, pages 1166. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1982.
[33] P. Stefanov. Support Theorems for the Light Ray Transform on Analytic Lorentzian Manifolds.
[34] P. Stefanov. Uniqueness of the multi-dimensional inverse scattering problem for time dependent potentials. Math. Z., 201(4):541559, 1989.
[35] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Microlocal Analysis and Integral Geometry. In progress.
[36] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Stability estimates for the X-ray transform of tensor fields and boundary rigidity. Duke Math. J., 123(3):445467, 2004.
[37] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Boundary rigidity and stability for generic simple metrics. J. Amer. Math. Soc., 18(4):9751003, 2005.
[38] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. Integral geometry of tensor fields on a class of non-simple Riemannian manifolds. Amer. J. Math., 130(1):239268, 2008.
[39] P. Stefanov and G. Uhlmann. The geodesic X-ray transform with fold caustics. Anal. PDE, 5-2:219260, 2012.
[40] F. Tr‘eves. Introduction to pseudodifferential and Fourier integral operators. Vol. 1. Plenum Press, New York, 1980. Pseudodifferential operators, The University Series in Mathematics.
[41] G. Uhlmann and A. Vasy. The inverse problem for the local geodesic ray transform. Inventiones mathematicae, pages 138, 2015.
[42] A. Waters. Stable determination of X-Ray transforms of time dependent potentials from partial boundary data. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 39(12):21692197, 2014.
[43] A. Waters and R. Salazar. Global stability for time dependent X-ray transforms on simple manifolds and applications. arXiv:1311.1591, 2013.

Department of Mathematics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907